

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 14 and 17 have been amended in several particulars for purposes of clarity and brevity that are unrelated to patentability and prior art rejections. Claims 1 and 14 are the independent claims. Proper support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the specification, at least, at paragraphs [0043]. No new matter is presented.

THE REJECTION OF THE CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-14 and 16-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Kim et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0012558.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites a reproducing apparatus comprising: an audio visual (AV) reproducing engine which decodes AV data; an enhanced audio visual (ENAV) engine, which includes player language information selecting one among a plurality of ENAV applications, each of which includes substantially similar contents and is made with a different language from the other ENAV applications, and interprets and executes the selected ENAV application with reference to the player language information in order to reproduce the AV data in an interactive mode; and a reader which reads the selected ENAV application corresponding to the player language information, based on language information of the ENAV application recorded on a startup file of an information storage medium read by the reproducing apparatus.

Kim further discloses with reference to FIG. 7, when the DVD 300 is inserted into a reproducing apparatus, a presentation engine 5 retrieving the language information contained in the file VIDEO_TS.IFO and determining whether a language designated as the first default value of the reproducing apparatus exists in the language information. If the language information contained in the file VIDEO_TS.IFO of the DVD does not have the language designated as the first default value of the reproducing apparatus, the presentation engine sets the language designated as the second default value of the file VIDEO_TS.IFO or DVD_ENAV.IFO of the DVD as the first default value for the reproduction of the markup document. That is, Kim discloses initially retrieving the language information from a first VIDEO file and if the language information is not found in the first VIDEO file, searching for the language information from a

second VIDEO file or from the ENAV file.

Contrary to Kim, independent claim 1 recites a reader reading the one ENAV application corresponding to the player language information based on language information of the ENAV application recorded on a startup file. That is, the reader searches for the language information directly in the ENAV file at startup and not in the VIDEO file as taught by Kim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) should be withdrawn because Kim fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) should be withdrawn at least because of their dependence from claim 1 and the reasons set forth above, and because the dependent claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9-13 also distinguish over the prior art.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 14, it is noted that this claim recites some substantially similar features as claim 1. Thus, the rejection of this claim is also traversed for the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claims 16-20, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 14 and are therefore also allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 14 and because these claims include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art.

THE REJECTION OF THE CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 4, 7-8 and 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0012558 as applied to claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-14 and 16-20 above, and further in view of Lamkin et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,178,106.

Initially it is noted that claims 4 and 7-8 depend from independent claim 1, and as noted above, Kim fails to teach or suggest the novel features of independent claim 1.

Furthermore, it is noted that the Office Action recites that Kim discloses language information being recorded in a startup file to be first read when the interactive mode is selected. Applicants respectfully traverse this characterization for at least the following reason. As noted

above, Kim discloses that if the DVD is inserted into the reproducing apparatus, the presentation engine retrieves the language information contained in the file VIDEO_TS.IFO and determines whether a language designated as the first default value of the reproducing apparatus exists in the language information. If the language information contained in the file VIDEO_TS.IFO of the DVD does not have the language designated as the first default value of the reproducing apparatus, the presentation engine sets the language designated as the second default value of the file VIDEO_TS.IFO or DVD_ENAV.IFO of the DVD as the first default value for the reproduction of the markup document. Accordingly, Kim discloses retrieving the language information contained in a video file and if the language information is not in the video file, then Kim retrieves the language information from another video file or the ENAV file.

Contrary to Kim, claim 1 recites a reader reading the one ENAV application corresponding to the player language information, based on language information of the ENAV application recorded on a startup file of the information storage medium read by the reproducing apparatus. That is, the language information is retrieved from the ENAV file at the startup and not after searching the video files. Accordingly, Kim also fails to teach or suggest this novel feature of independent claim 1.

Lamkin discloses an application programming interface (API) for integrating locally stored media content and remote interactively-obtained network media content, e.g., video content on a web page. The API enables embedding e.g., video content in web pages and can display the video in full screen or sub window format (column 4, lines 40-50). Lamkin further discloses that the goal of the API is to enable content developers to create products that seamlessly combine e.g., the Internet with content from other digital versatile disk-read only memory (DVD-ROM), digital versatile disk-audio (DVD-Audio) and compact disk-audio (CD-Audio). Accordingly, Lamkin discloses an API for combining Internet content with information storage media content. Lamkin makes no reference or suggestion to a reader reading the one ENAV application corresponding to the player language information, based on language information of the ENAV application recorded on a startup file of the information storage medium read by the reproducing apparatus, as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Kim and Lankin does not disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1. Thus, the rejection of dependent claims 4 and 7-8 is traversed, at least because of their dependency from claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of claims 21-23 it is noted that these claims depend from claim

14, and as noted above, Kim fails to teach or suggest the novel features of claim 14. As also noted above, Lamkin fails to cure the deficiencies of Kim and thus also fails to teach or suggest the novel features of claim 14. Thus, the rejections of these claims are also traversed for the reasons set forth above.

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0012558 as applied to claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-14 and 16-20 above, and further in view of Yamane et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,784,528.

Initially, it is noted that claim 15 depends from claim 14 and as noted above, Kim fails to teach or suggest the novel features of claim 14.

Furthermore, the Office Action recognizes that Kim fails to teach or suggest buffering AV data to ensure seamless reproduction of selected interactive data and relies on Yamane for such teachings.

Applicants respectfully assert that Yamane fails to disclose each of these features and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Kim.

Yamane discloses an interleaving method for generating a bit-stream from plural video objects containing compressed video data by arranging the presentation order. Yamane further discloses a random access system for ensuring seamless reproduction of selected scenes (column 39, lines 1-4). In other words, Yamane discloses using a random access system to ensure the correct reproduction of selected scenes. Contrary to Yamane, claim 15 recites buffering the selected interactive data corresponding to the AV data to ensure seamless reproduction.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Kim and Yamane fails to disclose each of these features and therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Claim 24 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0012558 as applied to claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-14 and 16-20 above, and further in view of Horiguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,370,322 and Winter et al., U.S. Publication

No. 2004/0076405.

Initially it is noted that claim 24 depends from independent claim 14, and as noted above, Kim fails to teach or suggest the novel features of independent claim 14.

Furthermore the Office Action states that Kim discloses that the ENAV data is selected automatically based on the SPRM and relies on paragraphs 0020 -0022, 0024, 0026 and 0062 for such teachings. It is respectfully noted that Kim fails to teach or suggest such novel feature.

Horiguchi discloses a data decoding system in which the system parameter of the devices forming the system for decoding the data transmitted through a digital interface is maintained always the same in all devices (paragraph 1, column 9-17).

Horiguchi fails to teach or suggest that the one ENAV application corresponding to the player language information, is based on language information of the ENAV application recorded on a startup file of the information storage medium read by the reproducing apparatus, as recited in independent claim 14 upon which claim 24 depends.

Winter discloses a method of organizing sub-picture data in sub-picture units (SPU), the sub-picture units comprising pixel data in a pixel data area (PXD) as well as display control data and/or address information data, wherein a sub-picture unit of a second sub-picture stream is inserted into the pixel data area of a sub-picture unit of a first sub-picture stream (paragraph 0001).

Winter also fails to teach or suggest that the one ENAV application corresponding to the player language information, is based on language information of the ENAV application recorded on a startup file of the information storage medium, as recited in independent claim 14 upon which claim 24 depends.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Kim nor Horiguchi nor Winter, whether taken singly or combined teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 14 upon which claim 24 depends.

CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to

be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney at the Washington DC office at (202) 216-9505. Applicants respectfully reserve all rights to file subsequent related application(s) (including reissue applications) directed to any or all previously claimed limitations/features which have been amended or canceled, or to any or all limitations/features not yet claimed, i.e., Applicants have no intention or desire to dedicate or surrender any limitations/features of the disclosed invention to the public.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 10/23/07

By: Douglas Rodriguez
Douglas X. Rodriguez
Registration No. 47,269

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510